

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5-9, and 13 are now pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration.

Amendment

Claims 17, 18, and 35 have been canceled, and claims 1, 2, 5-9, and 13 have been amended to more clearly define the present invention. Specifically, independent claims 1 and 9 have been amended to define that a display displays a main video window and a plurality of subsidiary video windows having different window sizes, and that an image based on image data for the selected video window is displayed in the main video window, and other images based on other image data for the non-selected video windows are displayed in the subsidiary video windows with the window sizes according to the selection history information stored in the storage, in response to the selection of one of the video windows. Independent claims 5 and 13 have been amended to define that the display displays a main video window and a subsidiary video window, and operation panel windows, each corresponding to the main video window or the subsidiary video window, that are separate and discrete from the video windows in a display screen.

No new matter has been introduced.

Art Rejection

Claims 5, 6, 8, 13, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Ramirez Diaz (USP 6,476,858). Claims 1, 2, 9, 17, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ramirez Diaz in view of Martinez (USP 6,111,575) and Cecco (USP 6,310,631). Lastly, claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ramirez Diaz in view of Ishida (USP 5,684,969). Applicant traverses these rejections for the following reasons.

As to independent claims 5 and 13, applicant previously explained in the last reply that Ramirez Diaz would not have taught providing a separate and discrete operation panel window for controlling a video device. In response, the examiner now asserts that Ramirez Diaz discloses a plurality of discrete windows 103 each including a video window 121 and that the tool bar 120 of the window 103 corresponds to the claimed operation panel window that is separate and discrete from the video window 121. Applicant disagrees with the examiner's

assessment because the tool bar 120 is part of the window 103 that contains the video window 121. Accordingly, the tool bar is not separate and discrete from the video window 103.

Moreover, claims 5 and 13 now define displaying a plurality of operation panel windows, each corresponding to a main video window or a subsidiary video window. Each of the panel windows is separate and discrete from the main and subsidiary windows. Applicant submits that Ramirez Diaz would not have disclosed or taught the above features set forth in independent claims 5 and 13.

As to independent claims 1 and 9, applicant previously explained that the Ramirez Diaz/Martinez combination at best would have taught storing the history information instead of saving different versions of the same file. Further, applicant explained that, since Ramirez Diaz merely discloses the ability to change the size of each of the open windows, as well as the number of windows, even if Ramirez Diaz were able to store the selection history information, the combination still would not have taught determining the window size based on the selection history information. In response, the examiner now asserts that Martinez teaches allowing the user to change specs of an application window based on the stored selection history information, relying on the passage set forth in column 8, lines 30-60.

Independent claims 1 and 9 now call for displaying a main video window and a plurality of subsidiary video windows having different window sizes, and that an image based on image data for the selected video window is displayed in the main video window, and other images based on other image data for the non-selected video windows are displayed in the subsidiary video windows with the window sizes according to the selection history information stored in the storage, in response to the selection of one of the video windows. Applicant submits that the combination urged by the examiner would not have taught the above features set forth in independent claims 1 and 9.

As to claim 7, applicant previously explained that the passage (column 8, lines 26-64 of Ishida) relied upon by the examiner states nothing about changing the number of operating buttons of the displayed window, and that Ishida merely discloses scaling down the displayed window. The examiner again failed to respond to applicant's argument. Since Ishida does not disclose anywhere about changing the number of operating buttons according to the resizing of the window, applicant submits that dependent claim 7 clearly defines over the applied references.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that the pending claims patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

31 OCTOBER 2007

DATE

/Lyle Kimms 103107/

LYLE KIMMS

REG. NO. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826

ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826

703-726-6020 (PHONE)

703-726-6024 (FAX)